

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 987

SP 020 126

AUTHOR Wyatt, Carolyn; And Others
TITLE The Effectiveness of the Teacher Corps Network System in Creating Better Linkages Between Schools, Federally Funded Projects, and Colleges of Education: Perceptions from Participants.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Houston, TX, February 17-20, 1982) and at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education (New Orleans, LA, November 1981).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cost Effectiveness; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Dissemination, Inservice Teacher Education; Linking Agents; Networks; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program Attitudes; Self Evaluation (Groups); Summative Evaluation; Teacher Centers; Teacher Education Programs; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study of the evaluative perceptions of people who had worked with Teacher Corps in 12 regional networks. Respondents to the study questionnaire included 155 project directors, 11 executive secretaries, 120 deans of colleges of education, three national program officers, and 38 individuals who had been involved with Teacher Corps in other capacities. The 86-item questionnaire addressed: (1) information dissemination; (2) communication and collaborative decision making; (3) time- and cost-efficient program management; (4) provision of technical assistance for individual projects; (5) enhancement of professional development; (6) effectiveness of role functions within the network; and (7) global perceptions of Teacher Corps networks and desirability of network reinstatement. Results in each category are discussed, and comparisons between respondent groups are analyzed. A positive conclusion is reached on the effectiveness of networking for information dissemination among geographically disparate groups that share a common goal. Tables appended to the report show the responses of project directors, deans, and others to each question, as well as the percent of responses to each question for the total group of respondents. (FG)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

The Effectiveness of the Teacher Corps Network System in
Creating Better Linkages Between Schools, Federally
Funded Projects, and Colleges of Education:
Perceptions from Participants

by

Carolyn Wyatt
Teacher Corps Documentor/Evaluator
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

Dr. Barbara O'Neill
Teacher Corps Research Associate
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

Nancy Noth
Assistant Director, Career Placement
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

Dr. Robert Harder
Teacher Corps Project Director
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

Fall, 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carolyn Wyatt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Effectiveness of the Teacher Corps Network System in
Creating Better Linkages Between Schools, Federally
Funded Projects, and Colleges of Education:
Perceptions from Participants

Teacher Corps networks were instituted nationwide in 1974, continuing through 1979, when they were disbanded because of federal budget reductions. Until this study, no comprehensive attempts to evaluate the network system's effectiveness had been made. In addition to providing evaluative perceptions from former Teacher Corps networks about this particular system, the study also yields more generalizable information about the value of the networking process as a means of maximizing human and monetary resources. This information may be useful to persons and groups considering organizing a network as a means of disseminating information, uniting to achieve common goals, and providing mutual support through the exchange of ideas.

Method

The Teacher Corps Network Effectiveness Questionnaire was constructed and field tested by members of the Washington State University faculty, Washington State University Teacher Corps personnel, and directors from other Teacher Corps sites. The research questions were designed to assess network participants' attitudes pertaining to overall network functioning in several major areas including: (a) dissemination of information, (b) communication/collaborative decision-making, (c) time/cost-efficient management of programs, (d) provision of technical assistance for service to individual projects, (e) enhancement of professional development, (f) effectiveness of role functions within the network, and (g) global perceptions of Teacher Corps networks and desirability of network reinstatement.

The Teacher Corps Network Effectiveness Questionnaire consisted of 86 items. It was designed for computer analysis by allowing respondents to choose between varying response options. Respondents were allowed the opportunity to comment on issues they might have felt were not addressed adequately in the questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire is included following the report.

The instrument was mailed to 500 individuals who had various responsibilities in Teacher Corps networks during the years they were active. Extensive follow-up efforts resulted in a return rate of 65% (n=327). Most non-responses were due to inability to locate individuals who had moved since their participation in Teacher Corps. The respondent group included 155 Project Directors, 11 Executive Secretaries, 120 Deans of Colleges of Education, 3 National Program Officers and 38 other individuals who had been involved with Teacher Corps in other capacities.

The respondent group represented all networks. The largest group (15%) had been involved in the Midwest Teacher Corps Network, and the smallest group (5%) had participated in the Texas Network. About two-thirds of respondents indicated that they are currently involved in Teacher Corps projects.

Since the data resulting from the questionnaire was extensive, only the most salient findings have been reported here. However, the results for the total respondent group, are included on the questionnaire following this report. The results described here are organized around the specific research areas listed previously.

A chi square test was used to assess differences in perceptions between the two largest groups of respondents--Project Directors and Deans, representing 49% and 38%, respectively, of the respondent group. In addition, chi square was also used to compare perceptions of Directors who had been

involved in Teacher Corps for at least five years (and therefore were involved in networks during their developing and active phases) with Directors who had been involved in Teacher Corps only one to two years.

The level of probability accepted as revealing a significant association between the respondent groups and their responses to an item was $p < .05$.

"Do not know" responses were dropped from statistical analyses as these responses were not definitive answers to an item and could cause inflated levels of significance. When the chi square test was statistically significant in comparing Directors and Deans, the corresponding items are marked with two asterisks (**) in the following tables, and, in many cases, referred to in the text of the report. The two Project Directors groups differed significantly in their responses to only three items. These latter differences are described in text only.

Results

Dissemination of Information

Several questions addressed the area of network information dissemination. Some asked directly about the effectiveness of this network function, and some items asked respondents to assess the changes they perceived in this area since the network was discontinued. Table 1 presents responses to these items, both for the total group of respondents, and for the two largest subgroups of respondents--Project Directors and Deans.

As can be seen from the table, the majority of all respondent groups indicated in items 9 and 15 that dissemination of information had decreased since networks were discontinued. A majority of directors saw the networks as very effective in the dissemination of information between the National Teacher Corps office and the individual networks, and also among and within networks (items 48, 49, and 50). Though the Deans were somewhat less

enthusiastic in their responses to this item, the majority felt that networks were at least somewhat effective in disseminating information. The majority of Directors and Deans viewed the Executive Secretaries' roles in the dissemination of information as at least somewhat effective (items 77 and 78), with both groups appearing to feel that this role of the Executive Secretaries was conducted most effectively within rather than between networks. For one of these items, (number 77) Project Directors evaluated the Executive Secretaries' role more positively than did Deans. Directors and Deans responded to item 78 in a comparable manner.

Deans and Directors perceived the quality of Teacher Corps network publications in similar ways (items 15 and 70). A majority considered half or more of these publications to be of high quality. However, most saw either no change or a decrease in the quality of Teacher Corps publications since networks were discontinued (item 14).

Communication/Collaborative Decision Making

Table 2 presents the responses of Project Directors, Deans, and the overall respondent group to selected items relating to the communication and/or collaboration functions of Teacher Corps networks. Some questions from the previous section also relate to this function, but the items reported here more clearly represent this category.

Briefly, Table 2 shows that Directors and Deans viewed the communication and collaborative decision making functions of the network similarly (see items 41, 51, and 66), and were generally positive in their perceptions of these areas. The overwhelming majority of both groups thought that since discontinuing networks, personal contact with other Teacher Corps personnel has decreased (item 8). Directors were quite positive in their evaluations of their Executive Secretaries' effectiveness as communications intermediaries among projects, interest groups, and the national office (items 75,

76 and 79). In addition, both Directors and Deans generally saw an increase in rapport among public schools, Colleges of Education, and communities as a result of the Teacher Corps networks' activities (items 42 through 44).

Time/Cost Efficient Management of Programs

With respect to specific network effects on efficient program management it can be readily seen from Table 3 that when "do not know" responses are disregarded, a majority of the combined Director/Dean group saw at least some effectiveness of networks in influencing time and cost efficient program management (see items 52 and 53). However, Directors evaluated their own networks more positively than did Deans. A majority of Directors felt that their networks were effective in reducing per-participant costs of programs and in reducing program organization time. Many of the Deans did not feel knowledgeable enough to respond to these latter items, as indicated by a large percentage of "do not know" responses. However, a large percentage of Deans responding definitively to these two items (i.e., 58% and 44%) did not see their network as effective in these areas.

Project Directors and Deans were much in agreement regarding the effects of network discontinuance on the efficiency of program management (see Table 3, items 19 and 20). A plurality of some 43 to 47% in both groups saw little change in this area since networks were disbanded.

The seemingly discrepant findings that networks were perceived to have contributed to efficient program management while they were active, through efficiency had changed little since networks were disbanded, suggest that Teacher Corps projects have been able to compensate by utilizing other management strategies. One possibility might be that informal communication systems resulting from personal contact during network meetings have been able to sustain some of the idea sharing that contributes to efficient program management.

Provision of Technical Assistance/
Inservice to Individual Projects

Table 4 presents responses to items on the questionnaire relating to the Networks' functions of facilitating inservice programs and technical assistance to individual projects. It is apparent from several of the items (i.e., items 21, 26-35, 45 and 47) that Directors were positive about their networks' role in this area. By comparing Directors' responses in items 21 through 24, it is apparent that the majority of directors felt that their network was more beneficial than any other outside technical assistance resource in meeting inservice needs. Most Project Directors viewed networks as "very effective" in providing them with technical assistance (item 26). Directors also saw other groups listed in items 27 through 35 as being benefactors in this network technical assistance role. Deans were somewhat less enthusiastic in their responses to items 21, 23, 26 and 31, but the majority of Deans were at least somewhat positive about networks' technical assistance roles. The majority of both Directors and Deans felt that inservice programming adapted to local needs were a focus of network activities (items 45, 47 and 69).

A chi square analysis revealed that Directors involved in Teacher Corps for five years or more differed from Directors with one to two years experience in their responses to item 34. Directors in the former group perceived networks' assistance to higher education faculty more positively than did Directors in the latter group.

Enhancement of Professional Development

Items 56 through 61, shown in Table 5, address the role of networks in facilitating professional growth. Directors' responses to items 56, 57, and 61 indicate that most felt that the network system had greatly influenced their professional development, apparently through both formal and informal

contact with others with similar goals and concerns. However, the role of networks in serving as a vehicle for professional advancement was perceived by individual Directors in a more variable way (see item 60). Many Directors (44%) saw no benefits to Teacher Corps networks in terms of professional advancement, as compared to some 49% who did. Deans were once again less enthusiastic than Directors about the networks' influence on their professional development. This would be expected given their less direct involvement with their networks.

Directors with over five years of Teacher Corps experience responded more positively to item 61 than did Directors with one to two years experience. This would be expected, as mutually supportive professional relationships may take more than a few years to develop.

Effectiveness of Role Functions

Table 6 depicts items pertaining to respondents' evaluations of the roles of Executive Secretaries and Deans of Colleges of Education as these roles relate to overall Teacher Corps goals and network functions. As reflected in responses to items 73 through 79, Project Directors were very positive in their evaluations of the coordination and communication functions of Executive Secretaries. Deans also viewed these activities of the Executive Secretaries positively, though they responded to items 73, 74, and 77 in a somewhat less favorable manner as a group than did Directors.

Though a significant percentage of Project Directors expressed negative views, the majority of Directors and Deans indicated in item 81 that the inclusion of university deans in network activities helped institutionalize Teacher Corps program elements and individual project goals into their respective teacher education program. The majority of Deans viewed themselves as being at least somewhat effective in facilitating network operations (see item 82). The group of Directors, on the other hand, were more evenly split in their

evaluations of this latter item. For both items 81 and 82, a significantly higher proportion of Directors than Deans were negative about the facilitative effects of including Deans in network activities.

When the group of Directors were split into two groups with respect to number of years of Teacher Corps involvement, a chi square analysis of item 82 was statistically significant. The group of Directors with five or more years of Teacher Corps experience were clearly more positive about the Deans' facilitative role than were Directors who had only one to two years of Teacher Corps experience. This may be because Directors with greater Teacher Corps longevity would be in a better position to compare network operations before and after the inclusion of the Deans.

Global Perceptions of Teacher Corps Networks and Desirability of Network Reinstatement

Table 7 shows that both Project Directors and Deans were quite positive in their evaluations of the contributions of Teacher Corps networks toward the efficiency and success of local projects (items 37, 38, 54 and 84), though Directors were more positive than Deans in their responses to items 37, 54, and 84. In addition, both Directors and Deans perceived networks to have some positive impact on the development of teacher training programs (item 40).

Directors and Deans differed with respect to their opinion about the reinstatement of networks (item 86). Deans were fairly evenly split in their perceptions of the need for full, partial, or no reinstatement of networks, while Project Directors were strongly in favor of either full or partial network reinstatement.

Conclusions

The extensiveness of the questionnaire, with its coverage of most major issues and questions pertaining to the effectiveness of Teacher Corps networks,

make concisely summarizing respondents' evaluative perceptions very difficult. Those participating in networks in varying roles may have specific interests not directly addressed in the body of the report, and may therefore need to look directly at specific items on the attached questionnaire.

However, it may be confidently stated that the majority of participants in the study felt that Teacher Corps networks contributed positively to the goals of the Teacher Corps organization at all levels. The strong points of networks' functioning appear to be dissemination of information, facilitating inservice programs designed to meet individual project needs, and providing a professional support system and forum for professional development through both formal and informal contact.

When differences between Directors' and Deans' responses were observed, it was usually Directors who evaluated the numerous components of network functioning more positively than did Deans. However, this would seem reasonable in light of both groups' differing degrees of knowledge about and involvement in the networks.

Both Project Directors and Deans were quite enthusiastic in their evaluations of the Executive Secretaries' roles in facilitating the networks' achievement of their mission of disseminating information between local projects and between projects and the National Teacher Corps office. Respondents appeared to be split over the issue of whether the inclusion of Deans in network activities accrued positive benefits for the network operations; however, more than 50% of each group perceived at least some benefits for the institutionalization of training programs in Colleges of Education through the inclusion of Deans in networks.

Length of experience with Teacher Corps was a factor affecting the perceptions of Directors for only three of the 86 items. Directors with longer terms of Teacher Corps service evaluated more positively the networks'

assistance to higher education faculty and its benefits in providing them with a professional support system. They were also more positive about the Deans' roles in facilitating network operations.

In conclusion, the results of this study support the contention that a network system can be a viable means of disseminating information to participants who may be geographically isolated from one another and who share common interests and goals.

TABLE 1

Percents of Responses to Items Reflecting the Information Dissemination Function of Teacher Corps Networks

Items	Response Categories											
	<u>Increase</u>			<u>Decrease</u>			<u>No Change</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group
<u>Since the Teacher Corps Networks were discontinued, have you seen an increase, decrease or no change in the following areas within your projects?</u>												
9.**Sharing of information between projects	4	1	3	73	59	69	9	25	14	14	15	14
14. Quality of Teacher Corps publications	1	2	1	29	26	30	42	41	40	29	31	29
15. Amount of Teacher Corps publications	4	3	3	62	49	57	15	22	17	20	27	23
<u>How effective was your Network in:</u>												
	<u>Very Effective</u>			<u>Somewhat Effective</u>			<u>Not Effective</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group
48.**Disseminating information between National Teacher Corps office and local projects in a time efficient manner	61	40	50	25	38	32	11	11	11	3	10	7
49.**Disseminating information among Networks in a time efficient manner	55	34	46	25	30	28	13	19	16	7	17	11
50.**Disseminating information within your Network in a time efficient manner	64	41	55	24	38	29	12	13	13	0	8	4
<u>In what ways was the Executive Secretary effective?</u>												
77.**Disseminating information within Network projects	68	42	58	23	34	27	5	10	7	3	14	7
78. Disseminating information between Network projects	44	25	35	25	30	28	10	10	10	21	35	27

TABLE 1
(cont.)

	<u>Frequently</u>			<u>Occasionally</u>			<u>Rarely</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>
67.**How often were Teacher Corps Network publications utilized as instructional aids by you?	31	22	29	45	37	40	24	30	26	0	11	5
68.**How often did you receive publications developed by other Teacher Corps networks?	59	31	47	34	44	38	7	14	10	0	10	4
	<u>100%</u>			<u>99-75%</u>			<u>74-50%</u>			<u>Less than 50%</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>
70. Of the Teacher Corps Network publications you read, what proportion would you consider to be of high quality?	2	0	1	26	26	26	40	42	42	33	32	31

*Project Directors

**Chi square analysis with "do not know" responses dropped, reveal a significant association ($p < .05$) between the two largest groups of respondents, Project Directors and Deans, and their responses to this item.

TABLE 2

Percents of Responses to Items Reflecting the Communication/Collaborative
Decision Making Function of Teacher Corps Networks

Items	Response Categories											
	<u>Increase</u>			<u>Decrease</u>			<u>No Change</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Since the Teacher Corps Networks were discontinued, have you seen an increase, decrease, or no change in the following areas within your projects?</u>			<u>Group</u>			<u>Group</u>			<u>Group</u>			<u>Group</u>
8. Personal contact with Teacher Corps personnel within your former Network	2	1	1	78	73	76	6	15	9	13	11	13
16. Contact with National Teacher Corps office	10	6	8	46	37	44	30	36	31	15	21	17
<u>How effective was your Network in:</u>	<u>Very Effective</u>			<u>Somewhat Effective</u>			<u>Not Effective</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>
41. Increasing collaborative decision-making among individual projects in your region	48	30	42	33	32	33	18	22	19	1	15	6
42. Increasing rapport between public schools and Colleges of Education	21	14	19	49	42	46	27	30	27	3	15	8
43. Increasing rapport between communities and Colleges of Education	20	14	19	38	33	36	35	36	33	7	18	12
44. Increasing rapport between communities and public schools	23	13	20	45	27	39	28	32	27	4	27	14
51. Informing you of successful and unsuccessful practice in other Teacher Corps Networks	40	30	36	31	38	35	27	21	24	3	10	5

Table 2
(cont.)

<u>In what ways was the Executive Secretary effective?</u>	<u>Very Effective</u>			<u>Somewhat Effective</u>			<u>Not Effective</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>
75. Facilitating communication among regional projects	57	40	51	27	29	28	9	11	10	7	20	12
76. Facilitating communication among interest groups	49	29	41	34	32	33	11	14	13	6	25	14
79. Representing Network activities, accomplishments, and goals to the National Teacher Corps office	58	41	53	26	24	24	4	7	6	12	28	17
66. How often was there collaborative decision making between regional Teacher Corps Networks?	<u>Frequently</u>			<u>Occasionally</u>			<u>Rarely</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>
	19	16	17	31	27	30	21	14	18	29	43	35

*Project Directors

TABLE 3

Percents of Responses to Items Reflecting the Teacher Corps Networks' Function
in Time and Cost Efficient Program Management

Items	Response Categories											
	<u>Very Effective</u>			<u>Somewhat Effective</u>			<u>Not Effective</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group
<u>How effective was your network in:</u>												
52.**Reducing per-participant costs of programs	35	8	25	24	20	21	28	40	31	14	33	24
53. Reducing time spent in organizing program activities	30	11	24	33	31	30	31	33	31	6	26	15
<u>Since the Teacher Corps Networks were discontinued, have you seen an increase, a decrease or no change in the following areas within your projects?</u>												
	<u>Increase</u>			<u>Decrease</u>			<u>No Change</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group
19. Cost efficient management of programs	11	12	10	13	9	12	46	47	46	30	32	32
20. Time efficient management of programs	15	12	12	15	9	15	43	47	43	27	31	31

*Project Directors

**Chi square analysis, with "do not know" responses dropped reveal a significant association ($p < .05$) between the two largest groups of respondents, Project Directors and Deans, and their responses to this item.

TABLE 4

Percents of Responses to Items Reflecting Teacher Corps Networks' Technical Assistance and Inservice Functions

Items	Response Categories											
	Increase			Decrease			No Change			Do Not Know		
	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group
<u>Since the Teacher Corps Networks were discontinued, have you seen an increase, decrease or no change in the following areas within your projects?</u>												
11. Amount of inservice	9	5	6	38	29	36	35	49	38	18	18	19
12.**Quality of inservice	9	4	6	28	17	24	41	52	44	23	27	26
13.**Awareness of educationally related issues	4	3	3	42	28	35	38	55	45	16	14	16
17. Use of outside consultants	4	4	5	43	44	44	31	28	29	21	25	23
<u>Rate the following organizations as to their benefit in meeting the inservice needs of Teacher Corps projects in your region.</u>												
	Very Beneficial			Somewhat Beneficial			Not Beneficial			Do Not Know		
	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group
21.**Teacher Corps Networks	67	40	56	27	38	31	6	16	10	1	6	4
22. Stanford Research Institute (SRI)	2	1	2	17	21	18	66	48	58	15	30	22
23.**Site Specific Technical Assistance (SSTA)	13	5	10	33	47	39	44	21	32	9	27	19
24. Recruitment and Community Technical Resource Centers	11	6	8	38	27	34	47	26	36	5	41	22

TABLE 4
(cont.)

<u>How effective was your Teacher Corps Network in providing technical assistance to the following groups?</u>	<u>Very Effective</u>			<u>Somewhat Effective</u>			<u>Not Effective</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>
26.**Project Director	74	48	63	19	36	27	7	7	6	0	9	4
27. Dean	25	33	28	39	39	40	27	25	26	9	24	6
28. Principals	21	13	18	48	39	45	26	21	23	5	27	14
29. Vice-principals	11	11	10	27	27	28	42	23	32	20	40	29
30. Team Leaders	41	29	37	38	28	34	16	15	14	6	27	15
31.**Community members	44	21	35	37	33	36	15	15	14	4	31	15
32. Project Program Specialist	50	31	43	28	33	30	14	10	11	8	27	16
33. Documentor/Evaluator	37	31	35	40	34	38	16	12	12	8	23	15
34. IHC faculty	20	19	18	39	32	40	36	27	30	5	22	12
35. LEA faculty	22	16	19	44	26	38	31	25	27	3	33	17

How effective was your Network in:

45. Assisting you in the development of inservice programs to meet local needs	33	18	29	43	40	41	23	27	24	1	14	7
47. Identifying project needs prior to the planning of Network sponsored workshops	45	35	42	40	32	36	14	22	17	1	11	5

TABLE 4
(cont.)

	<u>More Focus on National Needs</u>			<u>Equal Focus on National and Local Needs</u>			<u>More Focus on Local Needs</u>					
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>			
69. To what extent did inservice programs sponsored by the Networks meet National priorities rather than local needs?	23	28	23	54	52	52	23	21	26			
	<u>Frequently</u>			<u>Infrequently</u>			<u>Never</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total</u>
72.**How often did your Teacher Corps project utilize the service of a Teacher Corps Network consultant for individual project needs?	27	26	29	53	56	51	18	2	12	2	16	9

*Project Directors

**Chi square analysis, with "do not know" responses dropped reveal a significant association ($p < .05$) between the two largest groups of respondents, Project Directors and Deans, and their responses to this item.

TABLE 5

Percents of Responses to Items Reflecting the Value of Teacher Corps Networks in Enhancing Professional Development

Items	Response Categories											
	<u>Most Beneficial</u>			<u>Somewhat Beneficial</u>			<u>Not Beneficial</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group	P.D.*	Deans	Total Group
<u>How beneficial was your Network in:</u>												
56. **Enhancing your professional development through formal Network programs	62	28	49	30	39	34	8	28	15	0	5	2
57. **Enhancing your professional development through informal contact at Networkwide workshops and meetings	68	32	55	29	44	33	3	20	10	0	4	2
58. **Assisting you in providing leadership to local projects	44	21	35	40	40	39	16	34	23	0	5	3
59. **Orienting new personnel to the goals and activities of local projects	38	18	32	34	31	32	26	35	28	2	16	8
60. **Serving as a vehicle for your professional advancement; e.g., job mobility/increased salary/professional recognition	25	6	19	24	20	23	43	66	50	8	8	9
61. **Providing a professional support system through contact with other projects which are engaged in similar efforts	61	29	49	30	37	32	9	27	16	1	7	4

*Project Directors

**Chi square analysis, with "do not know" responses dropped reveal a significant association ($p < .05$) between the two largest groups of respondents, Project Directors and Deans, and their responses to this item.

TABLE 6

Percents of Responses to Items Evaluating Executive Secretaries' and Deans' Roles in Teacher Corps Networks

Items	Response Categories											
	<u>Very Effective</u>			<u>Somewhat Effective</u>			<u>Not Effective</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
<u>In what ways was the Executive Secretary effective?</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>
73.**Meeting the needs of individual Teacher Corps projects	49	28	40	37	37	38	10	16	13	4	18	9
74.**Facilitating achievement of Network objectives	69	45	59	25	30	27	5	9	6	1	16	8
75. Facilitating communication among regional projects	57	40	51	27	29	28	9	11	10	7	20	2
76. Facilitating communication among interest groups	49	29	41	34	32	33	11	14	13	6	25	14
77.**Disseminating information <u>within</u> Network projects	68	42	58	23	34	27	5	10	7	3	14	7
78. Disseminating information <u>between</u> Networks	44	25	35	25	30	28	10	10	10	21	35	27
79. Representing Network activities accomplishments, and goals to the National Teacher Corps office	58	41	53	26	24	24	4	7	6	12	28	17
80.**To what extent was including university deans in the Teacher Corps Network activities effective in increasing the institutionalization of Teacher Corps program elements into teacher education programs?	28	36	31	33	39	36	29	15	23	10	11	10

TABLE 6
(cont.)

	<u>Very Effective</u>			<u>Somewhat Effective</u>			<u>Not Effective</u>			<u>Do Not Know</u>		
	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>	<u>P.D.*</u>	<u>Deans</u>	<u>Total Group</u>
81. **How effective were university deans in institutionalizing the goals of your project?	31	29	30	32	50	39	30	8	21	7	13	10
82. **How effective were the deans in facilitating Network operations?	16	26	20	32	37	35	43	18	31	9	18	14

*Project Directors

**Chi square analysis, with "do not know" responses dropped reveal a significant association ($p < .05$) between the two largest groups of respondents, Project Directors and Deans, and their responses to this item.

Percents of Responses to Items Reflecting Somewhat Global Evaluations of Teacher Corps Networks

***Project Directors**
****Chi square analysis, with "do not know" responses dropped reveal a significant association ($p < .05$) between the two largest groups of respondents, Project Directors and Deans, and their responses to this item.**

Percents of Responses to Each Item for Total Group of Respondents
(N = 327)

TEACHER CORPS NETWORK EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. During the time that the Teacher Corps Network was in operation, what was your specific title? If you served in two capacities, check the most recent role.
 1. 49 Teacher Corps Project Director
 2. 4 Network Executive Secretary
 3. 38 University Dean
 4. 1 National Program Officer
 5. 8 Other (please specify) _____
2. How long did you serve in this capacity?
 1. 4 Less than one year
 2. 42 1-2 years
 3. 28 3-4 years
 4. 26 5-6 years
3. Which of the following years were you involved in the role listed in Item No. 1? (Check all which apply.)
 1. 100 1974
 2. 99 1975
 3. 99 1976
 4. 100 1977
 5. 100 1978
 6. 99 1979
4. Which regional Teacher Corps Network were you affiliated with?
 1. 7 California Teacher Corps Network
 2. 8 Far West Teacher Corps Network
 3. 10 Mid-Atlantic Teacher Corps Network
 4. 9 Midsouth Teacher Corps Network
 5. 15 Midwest Teacher Corps Network
 6. 9 New England Teacher Corps Network
 7. 7 New York Teacher Corps Network
 8. 7 Plains Teacher Corps Network
 9. 8 Rocky Mountain Teacher Corps Network
 10. 9 Southeast Teacher Corps Network
 11. 6 Southwest Teacher Corps Network
 12. 5 Texas Teacher Corps Network
5. What is your current job title/position? _____
6. Are you currently involved in a Teacher Corps project? 1. 68 Yes 2. 32 No
If yes, in what capacity? _____
7. Was your project part of a subject area network (i.e., Youth Advocacy Loop) as well as a regional network?
 1. 17 Yes
 2. 74 No
 3. 9 Do not know

Since the Teacher Corps Networks were discontinued, have you seen an increase, a decrease, or no change in the following areas within your projects?

	1. Increase	2. Decrease	3. No Change	4. Do Not Know
8. Personal contact with Teacher Corps personnel within your former Network	1	76	9	13
9. Sharing of information between projects	3	69	14	14
10. Joint activities among projects	3	64	17	16
11. Amount of inservice	6	36	38	19
12. Quality of inservice	6	24	44	26
13. Awareness of educationally related issues	3	35	45	16
14. Quality of Teacher Corps publications	1	30	40	29
15. Amount of Teacher Corps publications	3	57	17	23
16. Contact with National Teacher Corps office	8	44	31	17
17. Use of outside consultants	5	44	29	23
18. National Teacher Corps office influence on individual projects	5	28	41	25
19. Cost efficient management of programs	10	12	46	32
20. Time efficient management of programs	12	15	43	31

Rate the following organizations as to their benefit in meeting the inservice needs of Teacher Corps projects in your region.

	1. Very Beneficial	2. Somewhat Beneficial	3. Not Beneficial	4. Do Not Know
21. Teacher Corps Networks	56	31	10	4
22. Stanford Research Institute (SRI)	2	18	58	22
23. Site Specific Technical Assistance (SSTA)	10	39	32	19
24. Recruitment and Community Technical Resource Centers (RCTRC)	8	34	36	22
25. Other contractors (specify _____)	21	15	21	44

How effective was your Teacher Corps Network in providing technical assistance to the following groups?

	1. Very Effective	2. Somewhat Effective	3. Not Effective	4. Do Not Know
26. Project Director	63	27	6	4
27. Dean	28	40	26	6
28. Principals	18	45	23	14
29. Vice-principals	10	28	32	29
30. Team Leaders	37	34	14	15
31. Community Member	35	36	14	15
32. Project Program Specialist	43	30	11	16
33. Documentor/Evaluator	35	38	12	15
34. IHE Faculty	18	40	30	12
35. IEA Faculty	19	38	27	17
36. Other	12	14	20	55

How effective was your Network in:

	1. Very Effective	2. Somewhat Effective	3. Not Effective	4. Do Not Know
37. Meeting diverse needs of projects in your regions	<u>42</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>
38. Providing an efficient means for coordination and delivery of services	<u>45</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>
39. Creating support for National Teacher Corps goals and projects	<u>56</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>
40. Encouraging the development of teacher training programs	<u>40</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>6</u>
41. Increasing collaborative decision-making among individual projects in your region	<u>42</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>
42. Increasing rapport between public schools and Colleges of Education	<u>19</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>8</u>
43. Increasing rapport between communities and Colleges of Education	<u>19</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>12</u>
44. Increasing rapport between communities and public schools	<u>20</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>14</u>
45. Assisting you in the development of inservice programs to meet local needs	<u>29</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>7</u>
46. Helping you establish clearer evaluation criteria for local projects	<u>31</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>6</u>
47. Identifying project needs prior to the planning of Network sponsored workshops	<u>42</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>
48. Disseminating information between National Teacher Corps office and local projects in a time efficient manner	<u>50</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>
49. Disseminating information among Networks in a time efficient manner	<u>46</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>
50. Disseminating information within your Network in a time efficient manner	<u>55</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>4</u>
51. Informing you of successful and unsuccessful practices in other Teacher Corps Networks	<u>36</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>5</u>
52. Reducing per-participant costs of programs	<u>25</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>24</u>
53. Reducing time spent in organizing program activities	<u>24</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>15</u>
54. Helping you achieve your project goals	<u>33</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>
55. Developing the community component of your project	<u>19</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>13</u>

How beneficial was your Network in:

	1. Most Beneficial	2. Somewhat Beneficial	3. Not Beneficial	4. Do Not Know
56. Enhancing your professional development through formal Network programs	<u>49</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>
57. Enhancing your professional development through informal personal contact at Network-wide workshops and meetings	<u>55</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>
58. Assisting you in providing leadership to local projects	<u>35</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>3</u>
59. Orienting new personnel to the goals and activities of local projects	<u>32</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>
60. Serving as a vehicle for your professional advancement; e.g., job mobility/increased salary/professional recognition	<u>19</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>9</u>
61. Providing a professional support system through contact with other projects who are engaged in similar efforts	<u>49</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>4</u>

62. Who obtained the major benefits of Teacher Corps Networking?

1. 47 Local project personnel 2. 11 National Teacher Corps personnel
 3. 33 Both groups 4. 4 Neither group
 5. 6 Other (specify _____)

	1. Frequently	2. Occasionally	3. Rarely	4. Do Not Know
63. How often did the National Teacher Corps office respond to unique needs of your Teacher Corps Network?	<u>34</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>19</u>
64. How often were the explicit directives from the National Teacher Corps office supported by your Teacher Corps Network?	<u>61</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>18</u>
65. How often were the implicit directives from the National Teacher Corps office supported by your Teacher Corps Network?	<u>50</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>20</u>
66. How often was there collaborative decision-making between regional Teacher Corps Networks?	<u>17</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>35</u>
67. How often were Teacher Corps Network publications and materials utilized as instructional aids by you?	<u>29</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>5</u>
68. How often did you receive publications developed by other Teacher Corps Networks?	<u>47</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>

69. To what extent did inservice programs sponsored by the Networks meet national priorities rather than local needs?

1. 23 More focus on national needs 2. 52 Equal focus on national and local needs
 3. 26 More focus on local needs

70. Of the Teacher Corps Network publications you read, what proportion would you consider to be of high quality?

1. 1 100% 2. 26 99-75% 3. 42 74-50% 4. 31 Less than 50%

71. Should Networks be organized around subject areas (e.g., Youth Advocacy Network) rather than geographic locales?

1. 21 Yes 2. 55 No 3. 24 Do not know

72. How often did your Teacher Corps Project utilize the services of a Teacher Corps Network consultant for individual project needs?

1. 29 Frequently 2. 51 Infrequently 3. 12 Never 4. 9 Do not know

In what ways was the Executive Secretary effective?		1. Very Effective	2. Somewhat Effective	3. Not Effective	4. Do Not Know
73.	Meeting the needs of individual Teacher Corps projects	40	38	13	9
74.	Facilitating achievement of Network objectives	59	27	6	8
75.	Facilitating communication among regional projects	51	28	10	12
76.	Facilitating communication among interest groups	41	33	13	14
77.	Disseminating information within Network projects	58	27	7	7
78.	Disseminating information between Networks	35	28	10	27
79.	Representing Network activities, accomplishments, and goals to the National Teacher Corps office	53	24	6	17
80.	To what extent was including university deans in the Teacher Corps Network activities effective in increasing the institutionalization of Teacher Corps program elements into teacher education programs?	31	36	23	10
81.	How effective were university deans in institutionalizing the goals of your project?	30	39	21	10
82.	How effective were the deans in facilitating Network operations?	20	35	31	14
83.	Were the roles of the Board of Directors and the Executive Secretary changed by the addition of the deans?				
	1. <u>25</u> Yes 2. <u>39</u> No 3. <u>35</u> Do not know				
84.	To what extent was the Teacher Corps Network valuable in the overall success of your Teacher Corps Project?				
	1. <u>44</u> Very valuable 2. <u>39</u> Somewhat valuable 3. <u>13</u> Of no value				
	4. <u>4</u> Do not know				
85.	To what extent did you feel a sense of responsibility for your Network's success?				
	1. <u>26</u> Full responsibility 2. <u>62</u> Some responsibility				
	3. <u>11</u> No responsibility 4. <u>2</u> Do not know				
86.	To what extent should Teacher Corps Networks be reinstated?				
	1. <u>42</u> Fully 2. <u>29</u> Partially 3. <u>20</u> No reinstatement is necessary				
	4. <u>9</u> Do not know				